UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,962	01/30/2004	Wladimir de Lara Araujo Filho	0023-0188	2502

44987   7590   02/13/2008
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER
HOANG, HIEU T

ART UNIT	.	PAPER NUMBER
2152		

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/766,962	FILHO ET AL.	
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		Hieu T. Hoang	2152	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the communication filed on 12/21/2007.

2.   Claims 1-34 are pending.

Response to Amendment

3.   The objection of claim 1 because of an extra word "device" is withdrawn due to

the amendment.

4.   The objection of claims 1, 13, 20, and 34 for the preamble is withdrawn due to

applicant's persuasive arguments.

5.   The U.S.C. 112 rejection of claims 1, 13 and 34 is withdrawn due to applicant's

persuasive arguments.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments on U.S.C. 103 rejection have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

7.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one

cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986).

8.   The first argument is on, e.g., page 16 of the Remarks wherein the applicant

argues that the prior art Bright-Prasad does not teach the "resolution process specifying

a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource."

Given its broadest reasonable interpretation, the claimed resolution process is a

process comprising steps (path) for determining which user identification is associated

with which network resource. The prior art Bright-Prasad discloses a path comprising

using identification of a user to perform authorization check and thereafter receiving a

respond with service information based on the result of the authorization process

(Prasad, fig. 4A, steps 4004 to 4009). In response to applicant's argument that there is

no suggestion to combine the references (page 18 of the Remarks), the examiner

recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some

teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves

or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*,

837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21

USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Bright discloses a gateway comprising an

AAA gateway for Authenticating, Authorization and Accounting (fig. 2), being used as an

agent for collecting information from an AAA server; likewise, Prasad uses a service

selection gateway to collect information from an authentication server (fig. 1). Prasad

service selection gateway implements a service resolution process based on user

identification (fig. 4A, abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in

the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bright and Prasad to

provide the system of Bright improved service selection using the AAA gateway

(Prasad, col. 2 lines 1-5).

9.   As to claim 5, on p. 19, applicant argues that the prior art Bright-Prasad does not disclose a resolution graph. The examiner respectfully traverses. According to the claim, a graph or map contains at least two vertices (data types) and an edge (resolver) that maps the two vertices. The prior art discloses at least two data types (user identification (as source vertex) and resources or services that user is qualified for (destination vertex)), an a resolver to map between the two data types (authenticating process that determines the resources associated with the user's identification) (fig. 4)

10.   As to claim 20, on p. 21, applicant argues that the prior art does Prasad-Doshi not disclose "a network information collector NIC configured to identify a management entity associated with one or more network elements required to satisfy the request". The examiner respectfully traverses. The prior art (Prasad, fig. 3, 4A) discloses a directory-enabled service selection system (NIC) that generates a list of services (one or more network elements required to satisfy the request) based on user identification using an authentication server or authentication scheme (or a management entity).

11.   As to claim 27, on p. 25, applicant argues that the prior art Prasad-Doshi does not disclose specifying an ordering of functions required to satisfy a resolution request. The examiner respectfully traverses. The prior art (Prasad, fig. 3, 4A) discloses a directory-enabled service selection system (NIC) that generates a list of services to satisfy a request for services including user identification (resolution request) using an

authentication scheme comprising plurality of steps (or ordering of functions).

Furthermore, there is no recitation in the limitation or the claim that requires the steps to

change based on different resolution request.

12.   In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references (page 18 of the Remarks), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can

only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce

the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so

found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir.

1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case,

Doshi discloses a gateway comprising an AAA gateway for Authenticating,

Authorization and Accounting (fig. 5), being used as an agent for collecting information

from an AAA server, as one of plurality of agents such as GSM PG and SIP PG;

likewise, Prasad uses a service selection gateway to collect information from an

authentication server (fig. 1). Prasad service selection gateway implements a service

resolution process (one resolver) based on user identification (fig. 4A, abstract). Doshi

also discloses a process of selecting a method of minimizing network resource cost

based on different criteria ([0031]-[0034], gateway selection methods or resolver(s) for

e.g., establishing a SIP to GSM call scenario). Therefore, it would have been obvious

for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Prasad

and Doshi to provide authentication resolver and call setup resolver that minimizes

network cost (Prasad, col. 2 lines 1-5).

Claim Objections

13.   Claim 1 is objected to as being incomplete for omitting essential structural

cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the

necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural

cooperative relationships are: there is no structural link linking the agents and the at

least one resolver with one another. Since this is a system claim, all components have

to be linked or coupled to one another. In the claim, there is functional relationship

between the components, but there is no clear direct intercooperation between the

components. Just because the resolver uses the information collected by the agents

does not mean that they directly intercoopperate with one another.

14.   Claim 20 is objected to for the same rationale as in claim 1. The gateway and the

NIC have no link between one another.

15.   Claim 34 is objected to for the same rationale as in claim 1. The "means for

collecting information" and "means for identifying" have no link between one another.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
>
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
>
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1, 4-21, 23-26 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bright et al. (US 6,950,876, hereafter Bright), in view of Prasad et al.

(US 7,197,125, hereafter Prasad).

18. For claim 1, Bright discloses one or more devices in a network comprising:

agents configured to collect information relating to other devices in the

network (fig. 2, protocol gateways PGs and application gateways AGs 211-221

collecting information from AAA server, SIP server, application server, etc); and

Bright does not explicitly disclose:

at least one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of

a subscriber, a network resource that manages elements associated with the subscriber

to implement network services for the subscriber, the resolver performing the

identification of the network resource in accordance with a resolution process

determined based on the information collected by the agents, the resolution process

specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network

resource.

However, Prasad discloses:

at least one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of

a subscriber, a network resource that manages elements associated with the subscriber

to implement network services for the subscriber (abstract, lines 6-15, service selection

framework generates a list of services based on subscriber's membership and collected

information such as authentication and authorization, fig. 1, authentication server

providing security service for the subscriber), the resolver performing the identification

of the network resource in accordance with a resolution process determined based on

the information collected by the agents (abstract, lines 10-15, authorization information

is retrieved by an agent from the directory server and used to identify services or

network resources for the user), the resolution process specifying a path from the

identification information of the subscriber to the network resource (fig. 4A, a path from

authorization the user using identification information 4-005 to engage network services

for users 4-011).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Bright and Prasad to provide the system of Bright

improved service selection using the AAA gateway (Prasad, col. 2 lines 1-5).

19. For claim 13, Bright discloses a method implemented in a network comprising:

collecting information pertaining to a plurality of different network devices

via a set of collection agents (fig. 2, protocol gateways PGs and application gateways

AGs 211-221 collecting information from AAA server, SIP server, application server,

etc); and

Bright does not explicitly discloses:

identifying one of the of the plurality of different network devices as a network

devices that provides services to a subscriber of the network based on information that

identifies the subscriber and based on the collected information.

However, Prasad discloses:

identifying one of the of the plurality of different network devices as a network

devices that provides services to a subscriber of the network based on information that

identifies the subscriber (abstract, lines 6-15, service selection framework generates a

list of services based on subscriber's membership, col. 21, left side lines 27-30,

identifying a server related to the service) and based on the collected information

(abstract, lines 10-15, authorization information is retrieved by an agent from the

directory server and used to identify services or network resources for the user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Bright and Prasad to provide the system of Bright

improved service selection using the AAA gateway (Prasad, col. 2 lines 1-5).

20.   For claim 20, Prasad discloses a system comprising

a gateway configured to receive network service requests from or on behalf of subscribers in a network, at least some of the service requests requiring configuration of one or more network elements to satisfy the service request (fig. 1, service selection gateway, fig. 5A, receives service request from a subscriber, then requests for privilege token from authorization server, and requests list of services from directory-enabled service selection);

a network information collector (NIC) configured to identify a management entity associated with the one or more network elements required to satisfy the service request (fig. 1, col. 11 lines 31-35, the directory-enabled service selection system generates a list of services and user information to answer the user's request for services)

Prasad does not explicitly disclose:

the NIC including: a plurality of agents configured to collect information relating to a state of a plurality of network elements, the collected information being used to identify the management entity.

However, Bright discloses:

a plurality of agents configured to collect information relating to a state of a plurality of network elements, the collected information being used to identify the management entity (fig. 2, protocol gateways PGs and application gateways AGs 211-221 collecting information from AAA server, SIP server, application server, etc).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bright and Prasad to provide the system of Bright improved service selection using the AAA gateway (Prasad, col. 2 lines 1-5).

21.   For claim 34, Bright discloses at least one device comprising:

means for collecting information pertaining to a plurality of different network devices via a set of customizable collection agents (fig. 2, protocol gateways PGs and application gateways AGs 211-221 collecting information from AAA server, SIP server, application server, etc); and

Bright does not explicitly disclose:

means for identifying one of the plurality of different network devices as a network devices that provides services to a subscriber of the network based on information that identifies the subscriber and based on the collected information, and for specifying a path from the information that identifies the subscriber to the network device.

However, Prasad discloses:

means for identifying one of the plurality of different network devices as a network devices that provides services to a subscriber of the network based on information that identifies the subscriber and based on the collected information (abstract, lines 6-15, service selection framework using an authentication and authorization service to generates a list of services based on subscriber's membership

and collected information such as authentication and authorization, col. 21, left side

lines 27-30, identifying a server related to the service), and for specifying a path from

the information that identifies the subscriber to the network device (fig. 4A, a path from

authorization the user using identification information 4-005 to engage network services

for users 4-011)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Bright and Prasad to provide the system of Bright

improved service selection using the AAA gateway (Prasad, col. 2 lines 1-5).

22. For claims 4 and 19, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claims 1 and 13.

Bright-Prasad further discloses the other devices in the network include at least one of

service activation engines, Radius servers, and Lightweight Directory Access Protocol

servers (Bright, fig. 2, AAA RADIUS server, col. 7 lines 36-38, LDAP server).

23. For claims 5 and 24, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claims 1, 20,

and 27. Bright-Prasad further discloses the resolution process generates a resolution

graph defined by vertices and edges, where the vertices represent network data types

used by the resolvers and the edges represent resolvers that can perform a mapping

from the data type represented by a source vertex to a data type represented by a

destination vertex (Prasad, fig. 4A, col. 12 line 21-col. 13 line 36, graph of vertices and

edges, e.g., 4-004 to 4-005, col. 10 lines 45-57, verifying (or resolving) for authorization

using username and password).

24.   For claims 6 and 25, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claims 5, 24 and

29. Bright-Prasad further discloses the resolution graph is further defined by constraints

that specify prerequisites for traversing the edges (Prasad, col. 11 lines 24-35, service

selection dashboard request service profile information from the directory-enabled

service selection system by providing membership, role, and authorization information,

the directory-enabled service selection system then traverses with the user and service

information).

25.   For claims 7 and 26, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claims 5, 24 and

29. Bright-Prasad further discloses the data types include at least one of an IP address,

an IP pool, and a service activation engine ID (Prasad, col. 10 lines 47-49, data type

used for authentication is username and password, however, it is known in the art that

IP address can be substituted with username to identify the user, because an IP

address is unique for a user connection, see Albert, fig. 2, CSG 130).

26.   For claim 8, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 1. Bright-Prasad

further discloses the agents are dynamically added in response to devices being added

to the network (Bright, col. 7 lines 36-38, add a LDAP interface for LDAP service).

27.   For claims 9 and 16, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claims 1 and 13.

Bright-Prasad further discloses the software agents include at least one remote agent

that executes on a one of the other devices with which the agents collect information

(Bright, col. 7, lines 32-35, CORBA common object request broker architecture for

provider's provisioning center).

28.   For claims 10 and 18, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claims 1 and

13. Bright-Prasad further discloses the network resource that manage the elements

comprises service activation engines (Bright, col. 7 lines 27-41, application gateway AG

interfaces with an application server for service activation).

29.   For claim 11, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 1. Bright-Prasad

further discloses the network resource that manage the elements are implemented

within routers (Bright, application server is a software engine and can be built within

routers).

30.   For claim 12, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 1. Bright-Prasad

further discloses the software agents push the collected information to the at least one

resolver (Bright, fig. 2, resolver or database manager receives collected information

from PGs and AGs interfaces).

31.   For claim 14, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 13. Bright-Prasad

further discloses pushing the collected information to a network information collector

(NIC) (Bright, fig. 2, database 209 collecting information from PGs and AGs).

32.   For claim 15, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 13. Bright-Prasad

further discloses transmitting the collected information to a network information collector

(NIC) when the collected information is requested by the NIC (Bright, fig. 2, database

209 collecting information from PGs and AGs).

33.   For claim 17, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 13. Bright-Prasad further discloses the information that identifies the subscriber is an IP address of the subscriber (Prasad, col. 7 line 18).

34.   For claim 21, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 20. Bright-Prasad further discloses the NIC further includes at least one resolver configured to create a resolution graph and identify the management entity by traversing the resolution graph (Prasad, col. 11 lines 24-35, service selection dashboard request service profile information from the directory-enabled service selection system by providing membership, role, and authorization information, the directory-enabled service selection system then traverses with the user and service information).

35.   For claim 23, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 21. Bright-Prasad further discloses the resolution graph is formed based on the information collected by the plurality of agents (Bright, fig. 2, protocol gateways PGs and application gateways AGs 211-221 collecting information from AAA server, SIP server, application server, etc).

36.   Claims 2, 3, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright-Prasad as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Albert et al. (US 7,237,025, hereafter Albert).

37.   For claim 2, Bright-Prasad discloses the invention as in claim 1. Bright-Prasad

does not disclose a plurality of host components that each provide a framework for

execution of the agents and the at least one resolver.

However, Albert discloses the same (fig. 1, plurality of distributed service

selection gateways SSG, each for execution of agents and resolver)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Bright-Prasad and Albert to provide a plurality of

resolvers in order to provide the system with features such as failover, and high

scalability.

38.   For claims 3 and 22, the claims are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 2.

39.   Claims 27 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Prasad in view of Doshi et al. (US 2003/0137991, hereafter Doshi).

40.   For claim 27, Prasad discloses a method of resolving a resolution request to

identify a management resource, the method comprising:

receiving a resolution request that includes an identification of a subscriber (col. 10

lines 48-52, request for service using user identification);

performing a resolution process that specifies an ordering of functions required to satisfy the resolution request (fig. 4A, a path from authorization the user using identification information 4-005 to engage network services for users 4-011);

and controlling the resolvers to perform the functions specified in the resolution process (fig. 4A, a path comprising steps (resolvers) for resolving and providing services to the user from authorization the user using identification information 4-005 to engage network services for the user 4-011).

Prasad does not explicitly disclose:

selecting resolvers designed to perform the functions specified in the resolution process;

However, Doshi discloses:

selecting resolvers designed to perform the functions specified in the resolution process (p. 3, table 1, [0034] lines 4-9, minimizing cost of triangle routing, and call legs in the service selection process)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Prasad and Doshi to provide authentication resolver and call setup resolver that minimizes network cost (Prasad, col. 2 lines 1-5).

41.   For claim 29, Prasad-Doshi discloses the invention as in claim 27. Prasad-Doshi further discloses the resolution process generates a resolution graph defined by vertices and edges, where the vertices represent network data types used by the resolvers and the edges represent resolvers that can perform a mapping from the data type

represented by a source vertex to a data type represented by a destination vertex

(Prasad, fig. 4A, col. 12 line 21-col. 13 line 36, graph of vertices and edges, e.g., 4-004

to 4-005, col. 10 lines 45-57, verifying (or resolving) for authorization using username

and password).

42.   For claim 32, Prasad-Doshi discloses the invention as in claim 29. Prasad-Doshi

further discloses the resolution graph is further defined by constraints that specify

prerequisites for traversing the edges (Prasad, col. 11 lines 24-35, service selection

dashboard request service profile information from the directory-enabled service

selection system by providing membership, role, and authorization information, the

directory-enabled service selection system then traverses with the user and service

information).

43.   For claims 33, Prasad-Doshi discloses the invention as in claim 29. Prasad-Doshi

further discloses the data types include at least one of an IP address, an IP pool, and a

service activation engine ID (Prasad, col. 10 lines 47-49, data type used for

authentication is username and password, however, it is known in the art that IP

address can be substituted with username to identify the user, because an IP address is

unique for a user connection, see Albert, fig. 2, CSG 130).

44.   For claim 30, Prasad-Doshi discloses the invention as in claim 29. Prasad-Doshi

further discloses selecting resolvers further includes associating a cost value with the

edges of the resolution graph; and selecting edges based on the associated costs

(Doshi, table 1 on p. 3, [0034] lines 4-6, cost of routing should be minimized, or selecting gateway should be based on the least cost).

45.   For claim 31, Prasad-Doshi discloses the invention as in claim 30. Prasad-Doshi further discloses edges that are associated with remote resolvers are associated with higher cost values than edges associated with local resolvers (Doshi, [0034] lines 4-6).

46.   Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad-Doshi as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Albert.

47.   For claim 28, Prasad-Doshi discloses the invention as in claim 27. Prasad-Doshi does not disclose a plurality of host components that each provide a framework for execution of the agents and the at least one resolver.

However, Albert discloses the same (fig. 1, plurality of distributed service selection gateways SSG, each for execution of agents and resolver)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Prasad-Doshi and Albert to provide a plurality of resolvers in order to provide the system with features such as failover, and high scalability.

Conclusion

48. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

49. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-

1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m.,

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2152
February 11, 2008